

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-20 are before the Examiner. Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S. C. §112 as being indefinite. Applicants have amended the claim to specify that the weight percent is of the combined mixture. Withdrawal of the rejection in view of this amendment is respectfully requested.

The Examiner indicated that claims 3, 4 and 5 were allowable since the prior art does not describe the claimed method comprising the required vessels. Applicant has amended claim 1 to incorporate the part of the specific vessel requirement of claim 3.

Claims 1, 2, 6-9, and 11-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Erickson et al. (U.S. 6,426,394). And, claims 1, 2 and 6-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Shamshoum et al. (U.S. 6,239,058).

Rather than address the merit of the rejections, Applicants have amended the claims in response to the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter. Thus Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

6/24/05

Paige Schmidt

Paige Schmidt  
Attorney for the Applicant  
Registration No. 38,556